

MR2685-105
Appl. No. 10/014,550
Amendment dated 17 December 2003
Responsive to Office Action of 1 October 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 1 October 2003. Responsive to the rejections made in the Official Action, Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 11 therein and Claim 11 has been canceled by this Amendment.

In the Official Action, the Examiner required submission of a Verified English Translation of Applicant's Priority Document, Korean Patent Application KR 2001-3685.

Attached hereto is the translation of the Priority Korean Patent Application KR 2001-3685 and a Verification made by the translator.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 6-7, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Chu, et al. Published Patent Application, #2002/0175449. The Examiner further rejected Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being obvious in view of the Chu, et al. reference. Claims 8 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over the Chu, et al. reference in view of a second Chu, et al. reference, U.S. Patent Application Publication #2003/0054035. Still further, Claims 5, 9-10, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over Chu, et al. in view of Choi, U.S. Patent Application Publication #2002/0192468. However, the Examiner kindly indicated that Claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all the limitations of the base Claim and any intervening Claims. With respect to the '112

MR2685-105
Appl. No. 10/014,550
Amendment dated 17 December 2003
Responsive to Office Action of 1 October 2003

rejection, the Examiner stated that the limitation "the working space" had insufficient antecedent basis.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 11 therein. The limitation "the working space" has been corrected to --a working space-- to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

With the inclusion of the subject matter of Claim 11 in Claim 1, such effectively is Claim 11, rewritten in Independent form, including all of the limitations of the base Claim, Claim 1, and any intervening Claims, of which there were none. Therefore, Claim 1 should now be allowable. As Claim 1 is allowable, all of the Claims dependent thereon should also be allowable, for at least the same reasons.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FOR: ROSENBERG KLEIN & LEE



David I. Klein

Registration #33,253

Dated: 17 Dec. 2003

3458 Ellicott Center Drive, Suite 101
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678